



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,431	09/30/2003	Gerardo Kobeh	11884/406501	2620
23838 7590 08/01/2008 KENYON & KENYON LLP 1500 K STREET N.W. SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20005				
EXAMINER				
ZECHER, MICHAEL R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3691				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/01/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/673,431

Applicant(s)

KOBEL ET AL.

Examiner

MICHAEL R. ZECHER

Art Unit

3691

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a final Office Action on the merits. The Amendment/Remarks received May 13, 2008, have been entered. **Claims 1-6, 8, 10, 13-14, 20, 23, & 27** have been amended. **Claims 1-27** are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-10, 13-18, 20, & 22-27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corrie et al. (U.S. 2002/0120538), and further in view of Kanefsky (U.S. 2005/0192826).

As per claim 1, Corrie et al. teaches a computer-implemented grant management method (See figures 1 & 2B, which illustrates architecture for a grants management system), comprising:

if so determining, based on a set of rules derived from administrative and financial requirements of the plurality of grants encoded in a database (See paragraphs 70 & 111, which discusses decision rules developed by the granting agency), if the converted data causes a limit defined under the one of plurality of grants to be exceeded (See paragraphs 155 & 164, which discusses how funds are obligated based on agreement accounting rules, and how a determination is dynamically made by the financial management system whether limits are exceeded), and

if not, admitting the requested transaction, (See paragraph 156, which discusses approving a request from a grantee),

otherwise, rejecting the requested transaction (See paragraph 148, which discusses rejecting an application if it does not meet the basic criteria and compliance requirements).

However, Corrie et al. does not expressly disclose:

a computer-implemented grants management method for managing a plurality of grants for a recipient received from a plurality of grant sponsors;

responsive to a transaction request and data associated therewith, converting values of the associated data from a domain of a transaction system to a domain defined for one of the plurality of grants; and

determining if the converted data maps to a classification that has been defined under the one of the plurality of grants to be valid.

Kanefsky discloses a method and system for managing and reporting grants (See abstract)

Both Corrie et al. and Kanefsky discloses methods and systems for managing grants. Kanefsky discloses managing numerous grants received from a plurality of grantors (See figure 1 and paragraph 21, which illustrates and discusses a grant management and reporting system incorporating a plurality of grants and grantors) and determining if received or imported grant or financial information falls within a specified grant (See paragraph 33, which discusses receiving/importing grant and financial information and establishing detailed records pertinent to a specific grant). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Corrie et al. to include converting received/imported grant and financial information to detailed records of a specified grant and incorporating automated management of multiple grants received by a recipient as taught by Kanefsky in order to provide data in a format that can be automatically uploaded, report the results of grant activities to multiple grantors, and to allow grantors to monitor the activities of grantees in real time (See paragraphs 7, 9, & 11, which discusses reporting grant activities to various administrative agencies, allowing the grantor to monitor the activities of a grantee in real time, and providing data in a format that can be automatically uploaded).

As per claim 2, Corrie et al. teaches wherein the domain of the transaction system and the domain of one of the plurality of grants are different (See figure 1 and paragraph 55, which illustrates and discusses a separate financial management server and grant management server).

As per claim 3, Corrie et al. teaches wherein the domain of the transaction system is the same as the domain of the one of the plurality of grants (See figure 1, which illustrates a financial management server and grant management server operatively connected in the same system).

As per claim 4, Corrie et al. teaches storing the transaction data in a database in the domain defined for the one of the plurality of grants (See paragraph 44, which discusses how the grant management system includes permanent or removable storage on which the process and data structures can be stored and distributed).

As per claim 5, Corrie et al. teaches determining if a report and/or a bill are due according to a predetermined set of report and billing rules (See paragraphs 77 & 161, which discusses status reports; and, furthermore, how the system receives financial reports and verifies award compliance);

retrieving transactional data stored in the domain defined for the one of the plurality of grants (See paragraph 160, which discusses accessing information from the grant management system); and

if the report and/or the bill are determined to be due, generating the report and/or the bill in the domain defined for the one of the plurality of grants (See paragraphs 77 & 161, which discusses status reports; and, how the system receives financial reports and verifies award compliance).

As per claim 6, Corrie et al. teaches an enterprise management system, comprising:

a transaction management system (See figure 1, which illustrates a financial management system), operating under a predetermined set of transaction rules and responsive to a transaction request by validating and accepting the transaction (See paragraphs 129 & 163, which discusses approving payment requests and accepting grant financial reports);

a grants management system provided in communication with the transaction system (See figure 1, which illustrates a grants management system operatively connected with a financial management system) and comprising:

an availability control unit to determine, based on a set of rules derived from administrative and financial requirements of the plurality of grants and encoded in a database (See paragraphs 70 & 111, which discusses decision rules developed by the granting agency), if the converted data would cause a limit defined under the grant to be exceeded (See paragraphs 155 & 164, which discusses how funds are obligated based on agreement accounting rules, and how a determination is dynamically made by the financial management system whether limits are exceeded); and

a database storing converted transaction of the transaction requests that map to valid classifications that do not exceed the defined limits (See paragraph 44, which discusses how the grant management system includes permanent or removable storage on which the process and data structures can be stored and distributed).

However, Corrie et al. does not expressly disclose:

An enterprise management system for managing a plurality of grants for a recipient received from a plurality of grant sponsors;

an interpretation logic unit to covert values of the transaction request from a domain of the transaction system to a domain defined for a grant identified from the plurality of grants; and

a dimensional control unit to determine if the converted data maps to a classification that has been defined under the grant to be valid.

Kanefsky discloses managing numerous grants received from a plurality of grantors (See figure 1 and paragraph 21, which illustrates and discusses a grant management and reporting system incorporating a plurality of grants and grantors) and

determining if received or imported grant or financial information falls within a specified grant (See paragraph 33, which discusses receiving/importing grant and financial information and establishing detailed records pertinent to a specific grant). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Corrie et al. to include converting received/imported grant and financial information to detailed records of a specified grant and incorporating automated management of multiple grants received by a recipient as taught by Kanefsky in order to provide data in a format that can be automatically uploaded, report the results of grant activities to multiple grantors, and to allow grantors to monitor the activities of grantees in real time (See paragraphs 7, 9, & 11, which discusses reporting grant activities to various administrative agencies, allowing the grantor to monitor the activities of a grantee in real time, and providing data in a format that can be automatically uploaded).

Claim 7 recites equivalent limitations to claim 4 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

As per claim 8, Corrie et al. teaches a reporting and billing manager to generate a report and/or a bill when the report is due according to a predetermined set of reporting and billing rules (See paragraphs 77 & 161, which discusses status reports; and, furthermore, how the system receives financial reports and verifies award compliance).

As per claim 9, Corrie et al. teaches wherein the reports and bills are generated in the domain defined for the identified grant (See paragraphs 77 & 161, which

discusses status reports; and, how the system receives financial reports and verifies award compliance).

As per claim 10, Corrie et al. teaches an enterprise management system, comprising:

a transaction management system (See figure 1, which illustrates a financial management system), operating under a predetermined set of transaction rules and responsive to a transaction request by validating and accepting the transaction (See paragraphs 129 & 163, which discusses approving payment requests and accepting grant financial reports);

a grants management system provided in communication with the transaction management system (See figure 1, which illustrates a grants management system operatively connected with a financial management system) and responsive to the transaction request by:

if so, determining, based on a set of rules derived from administrative and financial requirements of the plurality of grants encoded in a database (See paragraphs 70 & 111, which discusses decision rules developed by the granting agency), if the converted data would cause a limit defined under the grant to be exceeded (See paragraphs 155 & 164, which discusses how funds are obligated based on agreement accounting rules, and how a determination is dynamically made by the financial management system whether limits are exceeded); and

causing the transaction system to reject the requested transaction if the limit is exceeded (See paragraphs 152 & 164, which discusses rejecting a grant; and,

furthermore, adjusting commitments and obligations based on drawdowns and accruals; additionally it is inherent to reject funds based on not satisfying account rules).

However, Corrie et al. does not expressly disclose:

an enterprise management system for managing a plurality of grants for a recipient received from a plurality of grant sponsors;

converting values of the transaction request from a domain of the transaction system to a domain defined for a grant identified from the plurality of grants; and

determining if the converted data maps to a classification that has been defined under the grant to be valid.

Kanefsky discloses managing numerous grants received from a plurality of grantors (See figure 1 and paragraph 21, which illustrates and discusses a grant management and reporting system incorporating a plurality of grants and grantors) and determining if received or imported grant or financial information falls within a specified grant (See paragraph 33, which discusses receiving/importing grant and financial information and establishing detailed records pertinent to a specific grant). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Corrie et al. to include converting received/imported grant and financial information to detailed records of a specified grant and incorporating automated management of multiple grants received by a recipient as taught by Kanefsky in order to provide data in a format that can be automatically uploaded, report the results of grant activities to multiple grantors, and to allow grantors to monitor the activities of grantees in real time (See paragraphs 7, 9, & 11, which discusses reporting grant activities to

various administrative agencies, allowing the grantor to monitor the activities of a grantee in real time, and providing data in a format that can be automatically uploaded).

As per claim 13, Corrie et al. teaches a computer-implemented method for managing grants received from a sponsor (See figures 1 & 2B, which illustrates architecture for a grants management system), comprising:

receiving a transaction request and data associated with the transaction request from a transaction management system of a grant recipient (See paragraph 160, which discusses accessing information from the grant management system);

determining, based on a set of rules derived from administrative and financial requirements of the plurality of grants and encoded in a database (See paragraphs 70 & 111, which discusses decision rules developed by the granting agency), if the transaction request satisfies the rules imposed by the sponsor (See paragraphs 77 & 161, which discusses status reports; and, how the system receives financial reports and verifies award compliance);

if so, admitting the transaction request (See paragraph 129, which discusses approving payment requests);

otherwise, rejecting the transaction request (See paragraph 148, which discusses rejecting an application if it does not meet the basic criteria and compliance requirements).

However, Corrie et al. does not expressly disclose:

a computer-implemented method for managing a plurality of grants for a recipient received from a plurality of grant sponsors.

Kanefsky discloses managing numerous grants received from a plurality of grantors (See figure 1 and paragraph 21, which illustrates and discusses a grant management and reporting system incorporating a plurality of grants and grantors). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Corrie et al. to include automated management of multiple grants received by a recipient as taught by Kanefsky in order to report the results of grant activities to multiple grantors and to allow grantors to monitor the activities of grantees in real time (See paragraphs 7 & 9, which discusses reporting grant activities to various administrative agencies and allowing the grantor to monitor the activities of a grantee in real time).

As per claim 14, Corrie et al. teaches converting the associated data to a predetermined domain of a grant identified from the plurality of grants (See paragraphs 56 & 60, which discusses the interaction between a grants management system and a financial management system, including the use of EAI to process a request of a grant's financial activities).

As per claim 15, Corrie et al. teaches determining if the associated data maps to a valid budget entry for a grant (See paragraphs 60 & 61, which discusses mapping one system to a defined data schema and sending/receiving messages from one system to another thereby permitting integration; and, furthermore how the EAI tool component triggers updates to the financial system whenever any activity in the grants system has financial significance).

As per claim 16, Corrie et al. teaches rejecting the transaction request if the associated data maps to an invalid budget entry for the grant (See paragraphs 155 & 164, which discusses how funds are obligated based on agreement accounting rules, and how a determination is dynamically made by the financial management system whether limits are exceeded).

As per claim 17, Corrie et al. teaches determining if the associated data is consistent with a budgetary plan (See paragraph 129, which discusses approving payment requests; additionally it is inherent that payment request won't be approved unless it satisfies accounting rules).

As per claim 18, Corrie et al. teaches rejecting the transaction request if the associated data is inconsistent with the budgetary plan (See paragraphs 155 & 164, which discusses how funds are obligated based on agreement accounting rules, and how a determination is dynamically made by the financial management system whether limits are exceeded).

Claim 20 recites equivalent limitations to claim 5 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

As per claim 22, Corrie et al. teaches using a blocking indicator to indicate whether a report and/or a bill are due (See paragraphs 124-126, which discusses how grant managers and financial managers (i.e. manual operators) must clear requests before they are approved).

As per claim 23, Corrie et al. teaches an enterprise management system, comprising:

a transaction management system (See figure 1, which illustrates a financial management system), operating under a predetermined set of transaction rules imposed by a sponsor the grantee and responsive to a transaction request by validating and accepting the transaction (See paragraphs 129 & 163, which discusses approving payment requests and accepting grant financial reports); and

a grants management system of the grantee provided in communication with the transaction system (See figure 1, which illustrates a grants management system operatively connected with a financial management system), to determine if the transaction request satisfies the predetermined set of transaction rules imposed by the sponsor, and if so, storing transaction data, (See paragraphs 77, 160, & 161 which discusses accessing information from the grant management system, status reports, and how the system receives financial reports and verifies award compliance) wherein the grants management system comprises:

a reporting and billing manger to generate a report and/or bill to the sponsor pursuant to a predetermined set of reporting and billing rules and the transaction data (See paragraphs 77 & 161, which discusses status reports; and, how the system receives financial reports and verifies award compliance).

However, Corrie et al. does not expressly disclose:

an enterprise management system for managing a plurality of grants for a grantee received from a plurality of grant sponsors;

Kanefsky discloses managing numerous grants received from a plurality of grantors (See figure 1 and paragraph 21, which illustrates and discusses a grant

management and reporting system incorporating a plurality of grants and grantors). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Corrie et al. to include automated management of multiple grants received by a recipient as taught by Kanefsky in order to report the results of grant activities to multiple grantors and to allow grantors to monitor the activities of grantees in real time (See paragraphs 7 & 9, which discusses reporting grant activities to various administrative agencies and allowing the grantor to monitor the activities of a grantee in real time).

As per claim 24, Corrie et al. teaches wherein the sponsor and grantee run the grant on different terms (See paragraphs 1-7, which discusses how federal grants management and different agencies have diverse procedures and requirements related to grants management).

Claim 25 recites equivalent limitations to claim 5 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

As per claim 26, Corrie et al. teaches wherein the grant management system further comprises:

an availability control unit to determine if the converted data would cause a limit defined under the grant to be exceeded (See paragraphs 155 & 164, which discusses how funds are obligated based on agreement accounting rules, and how a determination is dynamically made by the financial management system whether limits are exceeded); and

a database storing converted transaction of transaction requests that map to valid classifications that do not exceed the defined limits (See paragraph 44, which discusses how the grant management system includes permanent or removable storage on which the process and data structures can be stored and distributed).

However, Corrie et al. does not expressly disclose:

an interpretation logic unit to convert values of the transaction request from a domain of the transaction system to a domain defined for an identified grant; and

a dimensional control unit to determine if the converted data maps to a classification that has been defined under the grant to be valid.

Kanefsky discloses determining if received or imported grant or financial information falls within a specified grant (See paragraph 33, which discusses receiving/importing grant and financial information and establishing detailed records pertinent to a specific grant). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Corrie et al. to include converting received/imported grant and financial information to detailed records of a specified grant as taught by Kanefsky in order to provide data in a format that can be automatically uploaded (See paragraph 11, which discusses providing data in a format that can be automatically uploaded).

As per claim 27, Corrie et al. teaches an enterprise management system, comprising:

a transaction management system (See figure 1, which illustrates a financial management system), operating under a predetermined set of transaction rules and

responsive to a transaction request by validating and accepting the transaction (See paragraphs 129 & 163, which discusses approving payment requests and accepting grant financial reports);

a grants management system provided in communication with the transaction system (See figure 1, which illustrates a grants management system operatively connected with a financial management system) and comprising:

an availability control unit to determine, based on the predetermined set of transaction rules, if the converted data would cause a limit defined under the grant to be exceeded (See paragraphs 155 & 164, which discusses how funds are obligated based on agreement accounting rules, and how a determination is dynamically made by the financial management system whether limits are exceeded); and

a database storing converted transaction of the transaction requests that map to valid classifications that do not exceed the defined limits (See paragraph 44, which discusses how the grant management system includes permanent or removable storage on which the process and data structures can be stored and distributed); and

a reporting and billing manager to submit a report and/or a bill according to a predetermined set of rules (See paragraphs 77 & 161, which discusses status reports; and, how the system receives financial reports and verifies award compliance).

However, Corrie et al. does not expressly disclose:

an enterprise management system for managing grants for a grantee received from grant sponsors;

an interpretation logic unit to covert values of the transaction request from a domain of the transaction system to a domain defined for an identified grant; and
a dimensional control unit to determine if the converted data maps to a classification that has been defined under the grant to be valid.

Kanefsky discloses managing numerous grants received from a plurality of grantors (See figure 1 and paragraph 21, which illustrates and discusses a grant management and reporting system incorporating a plurality of grants and grantors) and determining if received or imported grant or financial information falls within a specified grant (See paragraph 33, which discusses receiving/importing grant and financial information and establishing detailed records pertinent to a specific grant). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Corrie et al. to include converting received/imported grant and financial information to detailed records of a specified grant and incorporating automated management of multiple grants received by a recipient as taught by Kanefsky in order to provide data in a format that can be automatically uploaded, report the results of grant activities to multiple grantors, and to allow grantors to monitor the activities of grantees in real time (See paragraphs 7, 9, & 11, which discusses reporting grant activities to various administrative agencies, allowing the grantor to monitor the activities of a grantee in real time, and providing data in a format that can be automatically uploaded).

4. **Claims 11, 19, & 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corrie et al. (U.S. 2002/0120538), in view of Kanefsky (U.S. 2005/0192826), and further in view of Official Notice.

As per claim 11, Corrie et al. teaches a first database (See paragraph 44, which discusses how the grant management system includes permanent or removable storage on which the process and data structures can be stored and distributed).

However, Corrie et al. does not disclose first and second databases, one provided for the transaction system and the other provided for the grants management system, each storing transaction data of transactions admitted by the grants management system, the transaction system's database storing the original transaction data and the other grants management database storing the converted transaction data.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to include multiple databases in systems that are operatively connected. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Corrie et al. to include a first and second database for storing transaction data and converted transaction data in order to combine the known features of multiple operative systems and databases to achieve the predictable result of having more than one database for transaction data.

As per claim 19, Corrie et al. does not disclose wherein the administrative and financial requirements from one sponsor is different from the administrative and financial requirements from another sponsor.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to have different financial and administrative requirements for various grants (i.e. different requirements for financial aid loans as opposed to housing lotteries). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to modify Corrie et al. to include different financial and administrative requirements for various grants in order to combine the known features of grants and lending criteria to achieve the predictable result of assuring that a grantor's requests are satisfied.

As per claim 21, Corrie et al. does not disclose wherein the report and the bill are generated according to the sponsor's currency, dimension, and fiscal year.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to generate reports or bills according to pre-determined criteria. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Corrie et al. to include generating reports and bills according to a sponsor's request in order to combine the known features of reporting/billing and lending criteria to achieve the predictable result of providing lender's with documentation of bill/reports (i.e. billing/reporting at the end of every fiscal year).

5. **Claim 12** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corrie et al. (U.S. 2002/0120538), and further in view of Chen (U.S. 7,111,010).

As per claim 12, Corrie et al. teaches wherein the grants management system comprises a database (See paragraph 44, which discusses how the grant management system includes permanent or removable storage on which the process and data structures can be stored and distributed).

However, Corrie et al. does not disclose wherein the grants management system comprises a database storing a data cube of aggregated transaction data, the data

cube having dimensions of all parameters defined for all grants managed by the grants managements system.

Chen (U.S. 7,111,010) discloses techniques for managing information necessary for providing business support (See abstract).

Both Corrie et al. and Chen disclose methods of managing business information. Chen discloses the use of data cubes with various dimensions used to store information (See column 3, lines 20-45, which discusses how cube data and structure are used to store information). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Corrie et al. to include a data cube with various dimensions containing aggregated transaction data as taught be Chen in order to use multidimensional models, statistical computations, rule based systems, report generators and the like to enable a decision maker to understand, analyze and present relationships among various information entities (See column 4, lines 27-41).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments, see pg. 8 of the Remarks, filed May 13, 2008, with respect to the rejection of **claims 2-12, 14, 26, & 27** under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of **claims 2-12, 14, 26, & 27** under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, has been withdrawn.
7. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 1-10, 12-18, 20, & 22-27** have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.
8. In response to applicant's argument concerning Official Notice of **claims 11, 18, & 21**, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. MPEP § 2144.03(C) provides the

requirements to traverse an Official Notice: "Specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art." [emphasis added]

Applicant has failed to adequately traverse official notice because applicant has only made a general allegation that the notice was not proper, in no way addressing why any of the facts would not be common knowledge. Indeed, with no guidance as to why those simple facts officially noticed are not well known, it is impossible to provide a reference addressing Applicant's potential concern. Therefore, according to MPEP § 2144.03(C), the officially noticed facts asserted in the previous office action are deemed admitted prior art.

In furtherance of prosecution, Examiner refers applicant to the Kanefsky (U.S. 2005/0192826) reference. Kanefsky discloses multiple databases in systems that are operatively connected (See paragraph 23, which discusses data storage that may reside on a local server, grantee's server, or grantor's server), different financial and administrative requirements for various grants (See paragraph 30, which provides an example of grant requirements specific to U.S. federal agencies), and generating reports or bills according to pre-determined criteria (See paragraphs 35 & 36, which discusses viewing reports in predefined views).

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL R. ZECHER whose telephone number is (571)270-3032. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00 alt. Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Alexander Kalinowski/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3691

/Michael R. Zecher/
Art Unit #3691